

## Fair Political Practices Commission

**To:** Chairman Johnson; Commissioners Hodson, Huguenin, Leidigh, and Remy

**From:** Scott Hallabrin, General Counsel  
Lawrence T. Woodlock, Senior Commission Counsel

**Subject:** Pending Litigation

**Date:** August 2, 2007

---

### 1. *California ProLife Council, Inc. v. Karen Getman, et al.*

This action challenged the Act's reporting requirements for express ballot measure advocacy. In October 2000 the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of California dismissed certain counts and later granted the FPPC's motion for summary judgment on the remaining counts. Plaintiff appealed, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal affirmed that the challenged statutes and regulations were not unconstitutionally vague, and that California may regulate ballot measure advocacy upon demonstrating a sufficient state interest in so doing. However, the Ninth Circuit remanded the matter back to the district court to determine whether California could in fact establish an interest sufficient to support its committee disclosure rules, and that its disclosure rules are properly tailored to that interest. On February 22, 2005, the court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment on these questions. Plaintiff again appealed. The parties completed the appellate briefing, and Circuit Judges Noonan, Gould and Rawlinson heard oral argument on February 12, 2007. The court's opinion should be released within the next few months.

### 2. *FPPC v. Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, et al.*

The FPPC alleges in this action that the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians contributed more than \$7.5 million to California candidates and ballot measure campaigns between January 1 and December 31, 1998, but did not timely file major donor reports disclosing those contributions, and likewise failed to disclose more than \$1 million in late contributions made between July 1, 1998 and June 30, 2002. The FPPC later amended the complaint to add a cause of action alleging that the tribe failed to disclose a \$125,000 contribution to the Proposition 51 campaign on the November 5, 2002 ballot. Defendants responded to the lawsuit by filing a motion to quash service, alleging that they could not be civilly prosecuted because of tribal sovereign immunity. On February 27, 2003, the Honorable Loren McMaster of the Sacramento County Superior Court ruled in the FPPC's favor. Defendants filed a petition for writ of mandate in the Third District Court of Appeal, challenging the decision of the trial court. The petition was summarily denied on April 24, 2003, whereupon defendants filed a petition for review in the California Supreme Court. On July 23, 2003, the Supreme Court granted review

and transferred the case back to the Court of Appeal. On March 3, 2004, the Court of Appeal affirmed the Superior Court's decision, concluding that "the constitutional right of the State to preserve its republican form of government trumps the common law doctrine of tribal immunity." On April 13, 2004, defendants filed a Petition for Review in the California Supreme Court. On June 23, 2004, the Supreme Court granted the Petition for Review. Briefing was completed on April 1, 2005, and the Supreme Court heard oral argument on October 4, 2006. On December 21, 2006, the California Supreme Court issued an opinion affirming the Commission's authority to file a civil suit in state court to enforce the Act against the defendants. Of the seven justices on the California Supreme Court, four joined in the majority and the other three dissented. On January 8, 2007, defendants filed a petition for rehearing with the California Supreme Court. On February 28, defendants' petition for rehearing before the California Supreme Court was denied, and the parties have settled the case.

### *3. FPPC v. Santa Rosa Indian Community of the Santa Rosa Rancheria*

In this action the FPPC alleges that the Santa Rosa Indian Community of the Santa Rosa Rancheria failed to file major donor semi-annual campaign statements in the years 1998, 1999, and 2001, involving more than \$500,000 in political contributions to statewide candidates and propositions, and that defendants failed to disclose more than \$350,000 in late contributions made in October 1998. The complaint was originally filed on July 31, 2002, and was amended on October 7, 2002. On January 17, 2003, defendants filed a motion to quash service, based on its claim of tribal sovereign immunity. On May 13, 2003, the Honorable Joe S. Gray of the Sacramento County Superior Court entered an order in favor of defendants. On July 14, 2003, the FPPC appealed this decision to the Third District Court of Appeal, where the matter was scheduled for oral argument. The Attorney General filed an amicus brief in support of the FPPC's position. The court heard oral argument on October 19, 2004, and on October 27, 2004, issued a decision in favor of the Commission overturning the trial court's granting of defendant's motion to quash. The tribe filed a petition for review with California Supreme Court which was granted on January 12, 2005. However, any action on the case was deferred pending the outcome of the Agua Caliente case.

### *4. FPPC v. Chad M. Condit, et al.*

On January 10, 2006, the FPPC filed suit in Sacramento County Superior Court against Chad Condit, Cadee Condit, and the Justice PAC. The lawsuit seeks civil penalties against Chad Condit and the Justice PAC for violation of the Act's personal use provisions and its prohibition on cash expenditures, and civil penalties against Cadee Condit for violation of the personal use provisions. A trial date was set for July 7, 2007. The FPPC has now reached settlement with Cadee Condit, and all defendants have been dismissed.